UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,622	05/31/2001	Scott J. Broussard	AUS920010260US1	1783

35617 7590 05/27/2004

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P.O. BOX 684908
AUSTIN, TX 78768

EXAMINER	
BONSHOCK, DENNIS G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	6

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/870,622	BROUSSARD, SCOTT J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dennis G. Bonshock	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Final Rejection

Response to Amendment

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed on record in the file: Amendment A as received on 02-23-2004.

2. Claims 1-17 have been examined.

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Introducing Swing*, written by SUN, hereinafter is-SUN, and *Mixing heavy and light components* written by Amy Fowler, hereinafter m-SUN.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Introducing Swing*, written by SUN, hereinafter is-SUN, and *Mixing heavy and light components* written by Amy Fowler, hereinafter m-SUN.

5. With regard to claim 1, IS-SUN teaches a system for the graphical display of an object created by an application program running under an operating system (see page 1, paragraph 1), and a graphics resource component adapted to display the object independently of the operating system (see page 1, paragraph 5). IS-SUN, however, doesn't teach a proxy component which associates the object with the graphics

resource component and invokes methods of the graphics resource component to display the object, or a peer component, adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and route the events to the proxy. M-SUN teaches a method of implementing swing components similar to that of IS-SUN, but further teaches a proxy component that associates an object with a graphics resource component, and further displays the object, in that the proxy component is the swing class (see page 2, paragraph 2), and a peer component, adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and route the events to the proxy component, in that the peer component is the ancestor (see page 2, paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of IS-SUN and M-SUN before him at the time the invention was made to modify the swing component interface of IS-SUN to include the combinational properties as did m-SUN. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because swing components are themselves combinations of a lightweight component and a class library.

6. With regard to claims 2 and 10, which teach a system in which the peer component is independent of the operating system, and emulates the behavior of a second peer component that employs the windowing system of the operating systems, m-SUN further teaches, in page 2, paragraph 2, a ancestor peer which is independent of the operating system and a heavyweight peer which is employees the windowing system of the operating system.

7. With regard to claims 3 and 11, which teach that the object is part of a graphical user interface associated with the application program, IS-SUN further teaches, in page 1, paragraph 1, windowing components that are part of a graphically base program.

8. With regard to claims 4 and 12, which teach that the look and feel of a graphical user interface is independent of the operating system, IS-SUN further teaches, in page 1, paragraph 5, when the component "Metal" is used the same look and feel are used regardless of what operating system it is running on.

9. With regard to claims 5 and 13, which teach the application program being written in JAVA programming language, IS-SUN further teaches, in page 2, paragraph 7, programmers writing GUIs for there JAVA programs.

10. With regard to claims 6 and 14, which teach the proxy extends an existing class of software components belonging to the swing application program interface, IS-SUN further teaches, in page 1, paragraph 5 and page 6, paragraphs 1-5, that Metal is an extension of Swing.

11. With regard to claims 7 and 15, which teach the object being part of a layout, and the association of the object with the graphics resource component establishes a parent-child relationship between the layout and the graphics resource component, M-SUN further teaches in page 3, paragraph 4 and in page 4, paragraph 2, a parent child relationship between the object/layout and the graphical resource component in which mouse events of lightweight components fall through to the parent and mouse events on a heavyweight component do not fall through.

12. With regard to claims 8 and 16, which teach the parent-child relationship between the layout containing the object and the graphics resource component allows the graphics resource component to draw over an existing image of the object drawn with the aid of the windowing system of the operating system, M-SUN teaches, in page 4, paragraph 2 and page 6, paragraph 2 and the following picture, that if heavyweight components are used it is possible for them to obscure what is drawn by the windowing system of the operating system.

13. With regard to claim 9, IS-SUN teaches a method for the graphical display of an object created by an application program running under an operating system (see page 1, paragraph 1), and a graphics resource component adapted to display the object independently of the operating system (see page 1, paragraph 5). IS-SUN, however, doesn't teach a proxy component which associates the object with the graphics resource component and invokes methods of the graphics resource component to display the object, or a peer component, adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and route the events to the proxy. M-SUN teaches a method of implementing swing components similar to that of IS-SUN, but further teaches a proxy component that associates an object with a graphics resource component, and further displays the object, in that the proxy component is the swing class (see page 2, paragraph 2), and a peer component, adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and route the events to the proxy component, in that the peer component is the ancestor (see page 2, paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of IS-SUN and M-SUN before him at the time the invention was made to

modify the swing component interface of IS-SUN to include the combinational properties as did M-SUN. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because swing components are themselves combinations of a lightweight component and a class library.

14. With regard to claim 17, IS-SUN teaches a computer-readable storage device comprising: a windows-based operating system (see page 1, paragraph 1), an application program running under the operating system (see page 1, paragraphs 1 and 5), and a graphics resource component adapted to display the object independently of the operating system (see page 1, paragraph 5). IS-SUN, however, doesn't teach a proxy component which associates the object with the graphics resource component and invokes methods of the graphics resource component to display the object, or a peer component, adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and route the events to the proxy. M-SUN teaches a method of implementing swing components similar to that of IS-SUN, but further teaches a proxy component that associates an object with a graphics resource component, and further displays the object, in that the proxy component is the swing class (see page 2, paragraph 2), and a peer component, adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and route the events to the proxy component, in that the peer component is the ancestor (see page 2, paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of IS-SUN and M-SUN before him at the time the invention was made to modify the swing component interface of IS-SUN to include the combinational properties as did M-SUN. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because swing

components are themselves combinations of a lightweight component and a class library.

Response to Arguments

15. The arguments filed on 02-23-2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Reasons set forth below.

16. The applicant's argument that a "swing class" cannot be considered a "proxy component"

17. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that the swing class can be considered a proxy component in the sense that a proxy can mean an element that acts as a substitute for another element (swing for AWT). The office also maintains the point stated in the 02-03-2004 interview that give the art teaches a combination of two APIs that borrow screen resources from some sort of peer object, where in order to combine two APIs there must be a connecting element.

18. The applicant's argument that a "swing class", in itself, does not and cannot function to associate an object with a graphics resource component, invoke the methods of the graphics resource component, or display the object.

19. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that M-SUN teaches on page 2, paragraph 1, that a lightweight component is one that "borrows" the screen resource of an ancestor, where a lightweight component is that of swing (as shown on page 3, paragraph 4). M-SUN further clearly shows being adapted to display the objects (see page 6).

20. The applicant's argument that thought a "peer component" can be and "ancestor" of some other object, there is no evidence of the peer component being adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and to route the events to a proxy component

21. In response, the examiner respectfully submits that M-SUN teaches on page 2, paragraph 1, that a lightweight component is one that "borrows" the screen resource of an ancestor (peer component), where a lightweight component is that of swing (as shown on page 3, paragraph 4), in this system where both AWT and swing are used in the same application program (see page 1, paragraph 2).

Conclusion

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

23. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis G. Bonshock whose telephone number is (703)

305-4668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dgb

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173